



## Cultural Encounters in Translation: Analyzing Representation Issues of a Cognitive Metaphor Case in Literature

Ainur Alzhanova<sup>1\*</sup>, Zhannat Balmagambetova<sup>1</sup>, Aiman Zeinulina<sup>2</sup>, Aigul Aratayeva<sup>1</sup>, Nurgul Issabayeva<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Karaganda Buketov University, Kazakhstan, <sup>2</sup>Toraighyrov University, Kazakhstan

**Abstract** Cognitive linguistics posits that metaphor is the primary cognitive technique employed for storing and categorizing knowledge about the surrounding world. This study examines the representation issues of Nurpeisov's cognitive metaphor "*footprint is life path*" of the novel "Sońgy Paryz" in its direct translation (DT) into Russian and mediated translation (MT) into English. The study objective is to identify the ways of cognitive interpretation and verbal representation of the authorial metaphor in diversely structured languages. A comparative analysis of the texts permitted an exploration of the linguistic, cultural, and cognitive representations of the world pictures in Kazakh, Russian, and English linguistic cultures. This established the equivalence of linguistic units verbalizing metaphors, identified the frame-element structure of the original cognitive metaphor and its representation in translated texts, and evaluated the challenges of translating the cognitive metaphor and the suitability of its transfer into other languages. The analysis demonstrated that the authorial cognitive metaphor was conveyed with greater accuracy in DT than in MT.

**Keywords:** Cognitive metaphor, Metaphor translation, Direct translation, Mediated translation, Frame-element structure

### \*Corresponding Author:

Ainur Alzhanova  
[ainuralzhanova@bk.ru](mailto:ainuralzhanova@bk.ru)

**Received:** March 2024

**Revised:** May 2024

**Accepted:** June 2024

**Published:** June 2024

© 2024 Alzhanova, Balmagambetova, Zeinulina, Aratayeva, and Issabayeva. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).

### 1. Introduction

Language reflects historical memory, the national mindset, culture, and the psychology of the people. The most common metaphors, due to their familiarity, set a specific "conceptual field" that affects the perception and reaction of native speakers to reality (Kiseleva et al., 2022). Hence, in cognitive linguistics, metaphor is characterized as a basic technique of cognition and nomination of real-world objects as a tool for generating new meanings and creating artistic images. Lakoff and Johnson (1980, p. 4) posit that "metaphor is pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action". They argue that "our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature" (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p. 8).

<https://doi.org/10.22034/ijscsl.2024.2029453.3521>

According to cognitive metaphor theory (CMT), metaphorization is based on the interaction between the structures of the source and target domains. One-sided metaphorical mapping, as elucidated by Budaev and Chudinov (2013), results in the structuring of the conceptual target domain by elements derived from the source domain. This phenomenon, they argue, represents the essence of the cognitive potential of metaphor. Lunkova and Pavlova (2018, p. 905) observe that “many metaphors, especially cognitive metaphors, are culturally bound”, which can result in the misreading of the source text by the recipient. As the authors assert, the interpretation of metaphorical units necessitates a comparison between the source and target texts. In such a comparison, the target text should be regarded as the result of intercultural communication and the representation of foreign language culture in the recipient’s mind.

The paper aims to identify the methods of cognitive interpretation and verbal representation of the original cognitive metaphor “*footprint is life path*” as presented in Nurpeisov’s (1999) novel “Sońgy paryz.” This is achieved by comparing the source text (ST) with the direct translation (DT) by Belger and Kim (2002) into Russian and the mediated translation (MT) by Fitzpatrick (2013) into English. A cognitive metaphor represents not only a linguistic world picture but also a cognitive picture describing the way of thinking, worldview, and world understanding of the culture. As such, cognitive metaphor contributes to the study of the interaction between language, thinking, and culture. In order to achieve the goal, the following tasks must be completed: select fragments containing the lexeme “footprint” from the ST, DT, and MT; conduct a comparative analysis of the contexts of functioning of the cognitive metaphor “*footprint is life path*”; compare linguistic, cultural, and cognitive world pictures of Kazakh, Russian, and English linguistic cultures; determine the equivalence of linguistic units verbalizing metaphor in the three languages; examine the difficulties of metaphor translation, and assess the adequacy of its transfer into DT and MT. The image of footprints in the novel is essential, as the author endows it with anthropomorphic abilities. Footprints personify the protagonist’s life path, revealing his character, feelings, and experiences. Consequently, our work is based on studying the authorial cognitive metaphor “footprint is life path”, its cognitive interpretation, and its verbal representation in direct and indirect translations. The corresponding Nurpeisov’s original cognitive metaphor “*footstep is life path*” in DT and MT is achieved by identifying and comparing the frame-element structure of the metaphor. This study allows us to explore the national, linguistic, and cognitive pictures of the world, shedding light on how individuals from three different languages perceive reality.

## 2. Theoretical Framework

The fundamental processes of cognitive science research include perception, categorization, classification, comprehending the world, and the representation and storage of knowledge. These cognitive processes are intertwined with cognitive metaphor through the analogical thinking process. Cognitive metaphor posits that individuals utilize more familiar concepts and images to describe and comprehend less familiar or abstract phenomena. In this context, categorizing or comprehending new information involves the use of metaphors to structure and integrate it into one’s existing knowledge. Metaphors facilitate the understanding and assimilation of information, as they render abstract or plex concepts more accessible and ensure subsequent memorization and storage (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980).

It is important to note that Western researchers employ the term “cognitive metaphor” to describe the process of metaphorization. In the post-Soviet space, however, the term “metaphorical model” is employed in the works of Baranov and Karaulov (1991), Baranov (1994), Chudinov (2003), and Budaev and Chudinov (2013). In addition, there are several other terms for this concept, including “cognitive model”, “conceptual metaphor”, “metaphor model” (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980), and “lexical-semantic derivation model” or metaphorization (Kudryavtseva, 1993). We assume that this discrepancy in terms may be related to the methodology and research methods employed by a particular scientific school.

Once the terms have been defined, it is necessary to review the contributions of scientists who have investigated conceptual metaphors. The study by Lakoff and Johnson (1980) marks the inception of the theory of conceptual metaphor, which posits that metaphor is a cognitive mechanism. Lakoff and

Kövecses (1987) conclude that the majority of conceptual metaphors can be mapped onto specific parts of a prototype scenario. They argue that the prototypical model is central to the categories of cognitive models, and that different metaphors are variants of a common prototypical model, sharing a certain degree of family resemblance with each other. The conceptual integration theory proposed by Turner and Fauconnier (1995) posits a model of conceptual projection encompassing four or more mental spaces, diverging from the two-domain model previously proposed by Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) theory of conceptual metaphor. Consequently, conceptual integration theory has broadened the scope of investigating the intricate cognitive processes underlying metaphorical thinking. Fauconnier and Turner (1998) argue that a conceptual integration theory is necessary to adequately characterize mental projection. The authors contend that existing models of cross-space mapping do not fully explain the data and emphasize the importance of conceptual integration, which is often overlooked. Breitman et al. (2007) argue that metaphor involves analogy mappings between domains, which facilitate conceptual modeling by reinterpreting familiar models in new contexts. They advocate for a database schema discipline that leverages analogy mappings to reuse conceptual models' structures and constraints. Skrebtsova (2000) identifies two promising directions in the study of cognitive linguistics: connectionism and the neural theory of language. Connectionism is an attempt to model the activity of the human brain with the help of neural networks. The neural theory of language is implemented in the creation of artificial intelligence systems that simulate the physiological activity of the human brain. Kobozeva (2002) proposes a representation of a concrete metaphor in the form of two "tuples": a tuple of significative descriptors and a tuple of denotative descriptors, which are in an element-by-element correspondence. The realization of this idea presupposes the development of certain meta-linguistic agreements. The author posits that this approach to metaphor representation reflects the systemic nature of the metaphorization process. Additionally, it avoids imposing a single, definitive interpretation of the metaphor, while still imposing reasonable restrictions on the variability of the latter. Baranov (2003) bases his research on political discourse and posits that the study of metaphor reveals that a significant portion of metaphors are not expressed individually but rather collectively within a single metaphorical expression. In his review, Budaev (2007) highlights the preeminent position of the cognitive approach to the analysis of metaphor in modern metaphorology. At the same time, the author acknowledges the controversial nature of many aspects of the theory of conceptual metaphor, which has led to active research in numerous scientific fields and disciplines, providing new insights that have shaped the evolution of the field within different methodological frameworks. Budaev and Chudinov (2008) identify two scientific fields – political linguistics and modern metaphor theory – that have played a significant role in the emergence and development of political metaphorology. The authors argue that in modern political metaphorology, two leading concepts – cognitive and rhetorical – have been duly acknowledged, contributing to the successful advancement of political metaphorology. In modern science, the methods of studying political metaphors within the framework of national, functional (institutional and mass-media), historical, and personal discourse have been widely recognized. Comparative studies occupy a significant place within this direction. In contrast, the methods of studying political metaphors in terms of identifying basic cognitive structures, determining gender specificity, and studying the place of metaphors in non-verbal and creolized communication have received somewhat less recognition. Chudinov (2013) notes that political linguistics is one of the most intensively developing areas of modern Russian philology. This is explained by the increasing interest of society in the use of language in the sphere of political communication. The author's conclusion is that a comparative cognitive-discursive study of metaphorical models used in the political discourse of different countries allows for the distinction of national and universal features of metaphorical thinking, the differentiation of phenomena related to the language in which the text is created, and the differentiation of phenomena dependent on national mentality, socio-historical factors, and specific political situations. Strelnikova (2015) draws upon data from research in the fields of social psychology and linguistics to support the thesis that metaphors influence the perception of the recipient. At the same time, she identifies the place of family metaphor among metaphors and its pragmatic potential in political rhetoric.

A significant number of scholars from Kazakhstan have conducted research on metaphors as an object of study. These include comparative research in the field of political metaphor (Trichik, 2014, Zhunussova et al., 2023), the field of zoomorphic model of metaphorization (Temirgazina, 2017),

peculiarities and difficulties of metaphor translation (Aizhan et al., 2021; Toleubayeva et al., 2017), metaphorical explication of the specific concepts (Rakymzhan et al., 2022; Seliverstova & Zhunusova, 2018). Russian scientists have conducted research on this topic, including investigations into the use of metaphors in political discourse (Chudinov, 2001; Dyatlova & Pavlova, 2017), certain concepts in the context of the novel (Trynkova, 2008), metaphorical modeling of non-spatial spheres in modern English (Shamne & Yanina, 2014), metaphorical models as an object of modern linguistic research (Segal, 2017), and somatic metaphors (Shekhovskaya & Peretyatko, 2019). In recent years, there has been a discernible trend among Kazakhstani scholars in the growth of research on cognitive metaphors based on literary works.

The role of cultural aspects in translating the authorial cognitive metaphor is a topic of significant interest. It is understood that a cognitive metaphor reflects the author's worldview, which originates from the cultural environment in which his views and attitudes toward the world are formed. He (2017) posits that metaphors derive their associative meanings from a multitude of sources, including native literature, local customs, religions, worldviews, folk beliefs, senses of value, modes of thinking, and other cultural elements. These sources of meaning may vary in their distinctiveness and overlap in different cultural contexts. Consequently, translating culturally specific metaphors in a way that is both equivalent and adequate is one of the most challenging tasks for translators.

The following works are dedicated to the examination of metaphor translation in fiction. Kunilovskaya and Korovodina (2010) examine the methods of preserving imagery in the translation of authorial and common metaphors. Burmakova and Marugina (2014) employ a cognitive approach to investigate metaphor translation. Shalimova and Shalimova (2020) examine Newmark's strategies and techniques of metaphor translation in Stephen King's works. The following works are devoted to the study of metaphor translation from a cultural perspective. Hasar et al. (2013) investigate the relationship between metaphors and cultural patterns in the context of translation. He (2017) asserts that culture plays an indispensable role in metaphor comprehension and translation. Zahid (2019) proposes a model that transcends cultural boundaries in translation, thereby guaranteeing the retention of metaphorical strength and functionality in the target language from English literature into Arabic.

A comparative analysis of the cognitive metaphor translation allows us to identify similarities and differences in the perception of images of the world in a particular cultural society. Translating fiction is one of the most challenging types of translation, due to the necessity of conveying the imagery and cultural nuances of linguistic expressions. In our study, translating the authorial cognitive metaphor on the material of a work of fiction is further complicated because the mediated translation into English is made indirectly from the Russian translation of the novel. It is also aimed to consider the definitions of conceptual metaphor and metaphorical model. Kövecses and Benczes (2002, p. 4) define conceptual metaphor from the perspective of cognitive linguistics as "the understanding of one conceptual domain in terms of another conceptual domain". In accordance with Chudinov's definition, a metaphorical model is "an existing or emerging in the consciousness of a native speaker of a language a scheme of connection between conceptual domains, which can represent a certain formula  $X$  is  $Y$ " (Chudinov, 2003, p. 70). Therefore, there is a considerable overlap between the two definitions.

In order to describe a metaphorical model, Chudinov (2003) proposes that it is necessary to identify and characterize the following features: 1) The source domain, which encompasses the non-metaphorical meanings of units covered by the model, namely words in their primary meaning; 2) The target domain, which includes the metaphorical meanings of the units covered by the model, namely words in their secondary meaning; 3) Frames related to this model. Each of these is understood as a fragment of the naïve linguistic picture of the world, which structures the source domain; 4) The typical frame elements constituting each frame, as well as the underlying concepts that form the frame elements; 5) A component linking the primary and metaphoric meanings of the units covered by this model, i.e., the features that allow for the metaphorical rapprochement of both domains; 6) The discursive characteristics of the model, which pertain to the evaluation of the impact of the corresponding metaphors on the addressee; 7) The model productivity, which refers to its deployment ability and typical deployment directions in text and discourse. Additionally, it is also possible to calculate the frequency of use of the corresponding metaphor models and compare the frequency of



different models by taking into account stylistic, genre, and other text features. These will form the basis of our study of the cognitive metaphor “*footstep is life path*”.

This paper considers the cognitive metaphor “*footprint is life path*”. The authorial cognitive metaphor study allows us to examine the specifics of national and linguistic pictures of the world to reveal the peculiarities of perception, interpretation, and representation of the metaphor in question by translators of direct and mediated texts. The selection of a specific cognitive metaphor is influenced by the fact that the narrative begins and concludes with the protagonist’s reflections on his footprints, which symbolize his life trajectory and the challenges he has encountered along the way. Nurpeisov repeatedly returns to the description of footprints left on the snow-covered ice. The footprints serve as a direct reference to the protagonist’s recollections of his life experiences. In the novel, the footprints are personified while being viewed in isolation from the protagonist. When Zhadiger looks at his footprints, he is presented with a visual representation of his life journey, including all the experiences that have influenced his destiny. This allows him to reflect on the meaning and purpose of life, his destiny, and the destiny of all humanity. Therefore, footprints become one of the main domains of the cognitive metaphor we are considering.

To begin with, let us consider the definitions of the lexeme “footprint” in the explanatory dictionaries of the three languages. The Explanatory Dictionary of the Kazakh Language (Qazaq Tiliniń Túsindirme Sózdigi, n.d.) presents the following definition: “із” - a footprint of a man or an animal left on the surface. Ozhegov Explanatory Dictionary of the Russian Language (Tolkovyı Slovar Russkogo Iazyka Ozhegova, n.d.) defines “след” as the imprint of something on some surface or the streak left by the movement of something, for instance, footprints in the sand. Thus, in the two dictionaries, the basic definition of a footprint is that it is a footprint on some surface. In the English translation, Fitzpatrick employs two distinct lexical units to denote footprints: “tracks,” denoting the marks left on the ground by a person, animal, or vehicle (Cambridge Dictionary, n.d.), and “footprint”, signifying a mark made by a foot or shoe (Cambridge Dictionary, n.d.). As can be observed, the interpretation of the term “footprint” is consistent between the author and the translators.

It is of particular importance to consider the peculiarities of linguistic conceptualization and categorization when solving difficulties related to metaphor translation. Comparative studies of metaphorical conceptualizations allow us to reveal the national-cultural specificity of the picture of the world. During translation, metaphor undergoes three main transformation types: 1) remetaphorization; 2) neutralization; 3) demetaphorization. In the case of remetaphorization, the translator actualizes the original metaphorical meanings, recreating the pragmatic effect and activating images close to the host culture recipients. Neutralization is the formal preservation of metaphor, where the morphological level is preserved and the pragmatic effect of the text is weakened. Demetaphorization occurs when there is no similar metaphor in the target language, and the expression is conveyed by words in the direct meaning. Concurrently, Shatalov presents instances of zero equivalence, which suggests the intentional or unintentional omission of metaphors from the original text in the target text (Shatalov, 2007).

In addition to the classification of translation transformations, we were guided by the metaphor translation types proposed by Deignan, Gabrys, and Solska. The first type is an *analogous conceptual metaphor and its equivalent linguistic expression*. This type of translation implies a full correspondence between the original metaphor and its translation. In contrast, the second type involves a *similar conceptual metaphor and a different linguistic expression*, but there is a lexical replacement of the expression. The third type is the *use of a different conceptual metaphor*. This occurs when the original metaphor is represented by another one in the target language. Finally, the fourth type involves words and expressions with *similar direct meanings but different metaphorical meanings* (Yakovenko & Shakhaliyeva, 2021).

### 3. Methodology

#### 3.1. Materials

The empirical basis for this study was the 1999 novel *Sońgy Paryz* by Kazakh writer Abdi-Jamil Nurpeisov and its translations. In 2002, Kim and Belger produced a direct translation into Russian.

This work was subsequently awarded the Sholokhov Prize and translated into numerous other languages. In 2013, an English version of the novel was published, indirectly translated from Russian by the American translator Fitzpatrick. The book details the ecological disaster, the drying up of the Aral Sea, the plight of the fishing village, and the fate of the main characters: Zhadiger, Azim, and Bakizat. This article compares the texts of the direct and mediated translations of the Kazakh novel “Sońgy Paryz”.

Page | 37

The selection of the empirical material for the study was based on Nurpeisov’s novel “Sońgy Paryz” and its translations. This choice was justified by the prevalence of cognitive metaphors in the author’s style, which provided an opportunity to comprehend the figurative and stylistic system and reveal the cultural, linguistic, and cognitive worldview of the author. The research focuses on the identification of the ways in which the authorial metaphor “*footprint is life path*” is interpreted and represented verbally in diversely structured languages. By comparing the texts of the novel and its translations, it is possible to determine the equivalence of linguistic units by identifying the frame-element structure of the original metaphor. This allows us to evaluate the difficulties of translation and the adequacy of its transfer into other languages.

### 3.2. Procedure

To conduct a complex method, authors employed the continuous sampling of metaphors containing the cognitive metaphor “*footprint is life path*” in the ST, DT, and MT, along with contextual, definitional, and comparative analyses. The contextual analysis revealed the implicit content of the concept and Nurpeisov’s picture of the world. Contextual analysis encompasses the study of not only textual elements, but also those that extend beyond the boundaries of the literary work itself (Brown & Yule, 2000, p. 27). These include the author’s biographical context, worldview, psychology, creative era, and cultural milieu. By considering these factors in conjunction, a comprehensive and nuanced understanding of the novel’s pragmatic elements can be achieved. Nurpeisov describes the native village and the ecological disaster that befell it in the 1970s. The protagonist’s life is inextricably linked to his experiences of the catastrophic drying up of the Aral Sea. At the same time, the novel critiques the shallowness of human souls, which prioritize worldly goods over moral qualities, honor, conscience, and duty to nature, fatherland, and humanity. The traces, which symbolize the protagonist’s life path, illustrate the past, present, and future of individuals involved in natural catastrophes in pursuit of mercantile desires. These traces demonstrate that thoughtless actions have consequences, as evidenced by the case of the Aral Sea.

Regarding definitional analysis, it permitted the identification of similarities and differences in the lexical-semantic meaning of the lexemes “из” in Kazakh, “след” in Russian, and “footprint” in English. The comparison of the definitions of the word “footprint” in three languages has revealed a convergence in the interpretation of the source domain of cognitive metaphor by the author and translators.

The comparative analysis of the frame-element structure of the author’s cognitive metaphor demonstrated how it is represented in the translated texts and determined the equivalence. A comparative study is contingent upon defining specific national elements within the metaphorical system in the novel Sońgy Paryz, studying the characteristics of the authorial style, and determining the original cognitive metaphor representation in the translated texts.

## 4. Results

In order to ascertain the adequacy of transferring the cognitive metaphor “*footprint is life path*” in translation, we conducted a comparative analysis of the metaphorical units of the ST, DT, and MT. During the complex analysis of the original text, we identified the frame-element structure of the source domain “footprint”, which consisted of 15 frames and 32 corresponding elements. However, for the purposes of this article, we limited our analysis to a selected number of them.

### 4.1. Frame: Protagonist’s Temper; Frame Elements: Indecisive, Furious, Haggard, Obedient

The lexeme *сылбыр* [sylbyr] is defined as sluggish and inert. For example, *сылбыр адам* [sylbyr adam] means a sluggish person. Thus, *сылбыр изі* [sylbyr izi] denotes sluggish, dragging footprints.

The metaphor *сылбыр ізі* in translations retains the metaphorical image, *неровные, тягучие следы* [*nerovnye tyaguchiye sledy*] in DT, and uncertain, dragging traces in MT. Consequently, the translated texts reproduce a similar conceptual metaphor.

According to the source text, Zhadiger does not recognize his footprints. Furthermore, the author considers the footprints separately from the hero himself and compares them with each other. This is evident from the following excerpt: *шұбалаңдаған сілбу із ... ширығып, ары-бері адыраңдаса да, ақыры о да сұлдері құрып, әлсіреп, аяғының астына жығылыпты* (only the listless footprints dragging behind you, which lay powerless under your feet).

In this fragment, the footprints exhibit a number of characteristics, including *ширығу* [*shirygu*], which can be translated as “to become enraged, hardened in a figurative sense”. Another notable quality is *адыраңдау* [*adyrandau*], which can be interpreted as “to cocksure, giggle; to show ostentatious bravery”. Additionally, the footprints display *сұлдері құру* [*sulderi kuru*], which can be understood as “to become exhausted”. Another noteworthy quality is *әлсіреу* [*alsireu*], which can be translated as “to become weak, exhausted”. Finally, the footprints exhibit *жығылу* [*zhygylu*], which can be interpreted as “to fall, in a figurative sense – to be defeated, to submit”. Nurpeisov describes the exhausted footprints lying submissively under Zhadiger’s feet. This attribution of anthropomorphic features to inanimate footprints is indicative of the author’s peculiarity of the isolated depiction of the character and his footprints. In the MT, the translator does not convey all the characteristics of the footprints, in particular, the tiredness of the footprints. This may be due to the translator’s desire to facilitate the perception of the text by the target audience. Consequently, the adequacy of frame-element structure adaptation in direct and mediated translations is achieved due to the equivalence of the linguistic expression of the original metaphor in the DT and the linguistic transformation in the MT so that the original metaphor remains understandable for the recipients of both linguistic cultures (Table 1).

**Table 1**

*Representation of the Frame Describing Protagonist’s Temper Reflected in the Footprints, and the Appropriate Frame Elements in DT and MT*

Source text	Direct translation	Mediated translation
Ұзын қара кісі ізінен әлі көз алған жоқ; назарын тіктеп, ізіне қараған сайын өзін-өзі танымай қалып тұр. Иә, бұл бұрын бұндай емес еді; ізі де басқа еді; аяғын сүйретіп басатын жігіттің <i>сылбыр ізі соңында шұбалаңдап жатушы еді</i> ; ал бүгін бұған бірдене көрінді; әсіресе әне бір тұста аяғын арпаң-тарпаң басқан адуын қимылда қандай да бір жанын өртеген алапат ыза бар ма? Тек соңында <i>шұбалаңдаған сілбу із әне бір тұста әлденеге ширығып, әрі-бері адыраңдаса да, ақырында о да сұлдері құрып, әлсіреп, аяғының астына жығылыпты</i> (Nurpeisov, 1999, p. 12).	Высокий темнотный человек все еще не отрывал глаз от своих следов; и чем пристальней вглядывался он в эти следы, тем больше не признавал в них себя – прежнего; да, прежде он был не таким: и следы были у него другими; а ведь обычно ходил он, чуть приволакивая ногу, оставляя за собой <i>неуверенные, тягучие следы</i> ; а сегодня с ним явно что-то случилось. Особенно, смотри, вон в том месте, где шагал ты размашисто, бешено, будто гнал тебя <i>сжигавший душу некий безудержный неистовый гнев</i> , но чем была вызвана эта ярость? <...> лишь волочащиеся за тобой, нагнетающие уныние, <i>вялые твои следы</i> ; хоть и <i>взярились</i> вон в том месте, но и они вскоре <i>утихомирились, обессилели и покорно легли тебе прямо под ноги</i> (Nurpeisov, 2002, p. 12).	You, now a tall, dark-faced man, cannot tear your gaze away from your footprints. And the harder you stared at these tracks, the more you do not recognize your former self in them. Yes, you were different then and had different tracks. You used to walk <i>dragging your foot</i> a bit, leaving <i>uncertain, dragging tracks</i> , but today, something had clearly shaken you. Look! Over there, where you stepped boldly, crazily, as if some <i>unchecked furious anger</i> drove you, <i>burning your soul</i> since morning. <...> only the <i>listless footprints dragging behind you, which lay powerless under your feet</i> (Nurpeisov, 2013, p. 19).

#### 4.2. Frame: Causes of Misfortune/Failure; Frame Element: Finding the Culprit

In this fragment, the protagonist assesses his footprints as the source of his misfortune. Consequently, the footprints evoke feelings of wounded ego and anger, which the author conveys through the metaphor *шамына тию* [*shamyna tiyu*], meaning to arouse anger, insult, or prick. This metaphor has undergone a process of remetaphorization in translations. In the DT, the metaphor is presented as pricking the ego (*задевают и твое самолюбие*) [*zadevayut tvoyo samolyubiye*], while in the MT the translator used the synonym *to prick both you and your pride*, which is also in line with the author's intention.

The DT adds a metaphorical expression describing the imprints: *отпечатки твоих неудач, могущие вызвать уныние у кого угодно* [*otpechatki tvoih neudach, moguschiye vyzvat' unyniye u kogo ugodno*] (the imprints of your failures, which can cause anyone to feel despondent), which does not distort the author's intention but gives the translation fragment more expressiveness. This addition is absent in the MT.

Additionally, we observed an inconsistency in the narrative style in the following sentence. The protagonist ponders why individuals often attribute blame to others or external factors. This theme is reflected in the ST, where the phrase *“басындагы бар пәлені ... ізден көретіні не?”* (*basyndagy bar paleni ... izden koretini ne?*) is used. The equivalent description is employed in the DT *“почему, с какой стати винишь во всех бедах не свой несносный характер, а пытаешься спихнуть все на свои следы?”* (*why, why on earth are you blaming all the troubles not on your obnoxious character, but trying to push everything on your tracks?*), where the protagonist questions why they are held responsible for all misdeeds and asks themselves whether they should take responsibility for their actions. However, the MT omits this description. Consequently, the MT does not reflect the original frame element (Table 2).

**Table 2**

*Representation of the Frame “Describing Causes of Misfortune/Failure;” and the Appropriate Frame Element “Finding the Culprit” in DT and MT*

Source text	Direct translation	Mediated translation
Кім білсін, Бәкизаттың жүйкесін құртып біткен мына сылбыр із бүгін бұның да шамына тиіп, өшін кімнен аларын білмей тұр ма? ... Міне, бұ да басындагы бар пәлені өзінен, өзінің болып болған болмысынан көрмей, әлдебір ізден көретіні не? (Nurpeisov, 1999, p. 13-14).	Как знать, быть может, эти вялые следы, отпечатки твоих неудач, могущие вызвать уныние у кого угодно, вечно раздражавшие Бакизат, сегодня <i>задевают и твое самолюбие</i> , дружок, и ты не знаешь, на ком выместить свою ярость? ... Вот и ты..., да ты, <i>почему, с какой стати винишь во всех бедах не свой несносный характер, а пытаешься спихнуть все на свои следы?</i> (Nurpeisov, 2002, p. 13-14).	Those listless tracks that constantly irritated Bakizat, why is it, one wonders, that they <i>prick both you and your pride</i> today? And you stand and don't know on whom to unleash your fury (Nurpeisov, 2013, p. 21).

#### 4.3. Frame Footprints – Dogs; Frame Elements: Stray, Homeless

The fragment employs the verbs “түреген”, “лағып”, and “жөнелетіндей” in the ST and “вскинуты и потрусят, разбегутся” in the DT. It is noteworthy that the translator uses equivalent lexemes of the Russian language, and the image conveyed by the author is succinctly conveyed within the context of the Russian language. The metaphorical image of footprints, compared to the image of homeless, stray dogs, is adequately conveyed in the DT. The original image is preserved in the DT by replacing the original metaphor with a similar conceptual metaphor and its equivalent linguistic expression. However, the fragment is eliminated in the MT, indicating zero equivalence. Thus, the original metaphor is not conveyed in the English text, as shown in (Table 3).



**Table 3**

Representation of the Frame “Footprints - Dogs” and the Appropriate Frame Elements “Stray, Homeless” in DT and MT

Source text	Direct translation	Mediated translation
Ұзын қара кісі сәл қозғалса да <i>табан астында жатқан</i> <i>сылбыр неме кәзір-ақ сүлдерін</i> <i>көтере түрегеп, бұралқы</i> <i>иттей беті ауган жаққа лағып</i> <i>сүмпең-сүмпең шоқыта</i> <i>жөнелетіндей</i> (Nurpeisov, 1999, p. 13).	... странно, тебе почему-то кажется: стоит сейчас чуть всколыхнуться, чуть оттолкнуться ногой от земли, - и эти твои следы тоже вдруг вскинутся и потрусят, разбегутся, словно бездомные бродячие псы, бог весть куда (Nurpeisov, 2002, p. 13).	Translation is omitted.

#### 4.4. Frame: Last Steps; Frame Element: End of Life Journey

Nurpeisov imbues the image of traces with a human quality, endowing it with the capacity to speak. This quality manifests itself in the translations. The hero strives to understand the significance of the footprints. The author employs common vocabulary, which is metaphorized in the DT, and thus acquires the image of talking traces “говорящие следы” (*articulate footprints*). We observe an identical translation transformation in the MT.

In the Kazakh translation, “*титықтау*” (*tityktau*) means “to exhaust”, and “*зорығу*” (*zorygu*) means 1) to overwork, 2) to overexert oneself, 3) to be on one’s last legs (about a horse). The author correlates the images of traces with the exhausted horse, using the lexeme “*көлік*,” (*kolik*) which means a vehicle. The interchange of lexemes “transport” and “horse” is understandable to the Kazakh reader, as the horse has been an integral part of the nomadic life of Kazakhs for centuries. The translators use the concretization “*конь* (kon’) = horse” to avoid distorted perception of the metaphorical image. Furthermore, the author correlates traces with the end of life’s journey. Zhadiger senses his imminent demise and ponders whether this place is his final destination. This fragment is adequately represented in the translations.

The translators employed the cognitive metaphor “*footprint - life journey*” by utilizing the lexical complement “*незадачливая*,” (*nezadachlivaya*) thereby reinforcing the figurative portrayal of the character’s unfortunate life. Consequently, the translators were successful in retaining the original metaphorical images while conveying them through the use of concretization and addition (Table 4).

**Table 4**

Representation of the Frame “Last Steps” and the Appropriate Frame Elements: “End of Life Journey” in DT and MT

Source text	Direct translation	Mediated translation
Мына із не дейді, әй? Мынау құдды жарым жолға жеткенде <i>тақым астында титықтап</i> <i>зорыққан көліктей сүлдерін</i> <i>сүйретіп кеп, аяғындағы қара</i> <i>етікке басын сүйей</i> <i>жығылған ба, қалай? Жүрімі</i> <i>бітіп, жолы таусылып</i> <i>титықтап тоқтаған жері</i> <i>осы болғаны ма?</i> (Nurpeisov, 1999, p. 16).	О чем рассказывают эти говорящие следы? Неужели о коне, который, не проскакав половины пути, обессилел вдруг, выдохся под всадником и рухнул прямо к его ногам, дотянувшись из последних сил до тяжелых рыбацких сапог? Выходит, что здесь, в этом месте завершится и оборвется твоя незадачливая жизнь? (Nurpeisov, 2002, p. 16).	What were these articulate footprints telling you? Was it about the horse, which suddenly lost strength, exhausted under the rider, and sinking, stretching with its last strength under your heavy fishermen’s boots? Was it that here your unfortunate life would end and break off? (Nurpeisov, 2013, p. 23).

#### 4.5. Frame: Faulty Traces - Faulty Deeds; Frame element: Reflection of Essence and Deeds in Traces

Once more, the author animates the footprints, metaphorically bestowing upon them the ability to speak. The hero then poses the question of what the footprints are telling him. However, this question is omitted from both translations. The reason for this is that it is repeated in the original, and it is probable that the translator decided not to allow repetition in the DT, which, in our opinion, is not critical. The translator of the MT repeats the same technique following the DT text. In addition, the protagonist is curious about whether a person who has not repaired their footprints can repair their circumstances. That is to say, traces reflect the essence of a person and their actions. Consequently, the translators have effectively conveyed the author's intention through periphrasis and changes in sentence structure. The original metaphorical expression has been demetaphorized in the DT and MT, which has subsequently affected the mismatch of frames, as demonstrated in (Table 5).

**Table 5**

*Representation of the Frame “Faulty Traces - Faulty Deeds” and the Appropriate Frame Element: “Reflection of Essence and Deeds in Traces” in DT and MT*

Source text	Direct translation	Mediated translation
Апыр-ай, тірлікте ізі оңалмаған адамның ісі де оңарылмайтыны ма? Мына ізге қараш. Бұл не деп тұр? (Nurpeisov, 1999, p. 161).	Неужели и впрямь существует некая фатальная связь между следами человека и его сущностью? Вот погляди-ка ... (Nurpeisov, 2002, p. 159).	Does there really exist some <i>fatal connection</i> between a person's footprints and their essence? Look at that ... (Nurpeisov, 2013, p. 196).

## 5. Discussion

The objective of the research was to identify the ways of cognitive interpretation and the verbal representation of the cognitive metaphor “*footprint is life path*” in translations. The cognitive approach to the study of metaphor involves considering it in close connection with the culture in which it originated and functions, as it reflects human experience and its view of the world around us. Lakoff and Johnson (1980, p. 58) posit that “all experience is cultural through and through, that we experience our “world” in such a way that our culture is already present in the very experience itself”. The same concepts that constitute a metaphor may be understood differently in different cultures, which can complicate the process of their translation.

A comparative analysis of the cognitive metaphor in the ST and its DT and MT revealed similarities in the understanding of the source domain across the three cultures. Additionally, the analysis demonstrated the semantic closeness of Kazakh and Russian linguistic expressions, the equivalence of cognitive interpretation and verbal representation of the authorial cognitive metaphor, and some semantic distances of the MT from the original text due to the omission of several text fragments. The comparative analysis of the text of the novel “*Sońǵy Paryz*” and its direct and mediated translation allowed us to conduct a comprehensive study of the world pictures of Kazakh, Russian, and English linguistic cultures. In the course of the study, we identified 15 frames and 32 frame elements of the cognitive metaphor “*footprint is life path*” in the ST. A comparative analysis of the frame-element structure of the source domain “footprint” in DT and MT revealed the difficulties of metaphor transfer, determined the equivalence of linguistic units verbalizing the metaphor in translations (Shatalov, 2007), and the adequacy of interlingual adaptation of translated texts. It is evident that metaphors have undergone a process of translation-induced transformation. Furthermore, it is evident that indirect translation is a complex phenomenon (Li, 2017). In our case, representing metaphor through mediating language presents an additional challenge. The counting revealed one instance of a similar conceptual metaphor and its distinct linguistic expression, two instances of remetaphorization, one instance of metaphorization, four instances of demetaphorization, two instances of zero equivalence, three instances of a similar conceptual metaphor and its equivalent linguistic expression, one instance of the use of a different conceptual metaphor, and one instance of words and expressions with analogous direct meanings but disparate metaphorical meanings in the DT. In the text of MT, we

identified the following findings: two cases of similar conceptual metaphor and its other linguistic expression, one case of remetaphorization, six cases of zero equivalence, one case of metaphorization, three cases of demetaphorization, and two cases of neutralization.

The following discrepancies in the cognitive interpretation and verbal representation of the *footprint-life journey* cognitive metaphor in translations were identified: 1) Incomplete correspondence of the frame-element structure of the original text and translations; 2) Incomplete correspondence of the original frame elements in the mediated translation text is more frequent than in the direct translation; 3) The number of omissions of fragments in the mediated translation exceeds the number of omissions of fragments in the direct translation. This resulted in a twofold increase in the number of omissions, which inevitably affected the quality of the translation as a whole. In the direct translation, the translator frequently resorted to lexical additions and text expansion, which were justified by the differences in syntax, grammar, and the lack of clear lexical-semantic equivalents between Kazakh and Russian languages. In contrast, the mediated translation employs the technique of elimination to enhance the accessibility of the text for the target audience; 5) The translator utilized a range of metaphorical transformations and methods of linguistic and cognitive translation of metaphors. In contrast, the analysis of the mediated translation text revealed a smaller number of transformations and methods, with zero equivalence prevailing. This resulted in a significantly reduced expressiveness in comparison with the direct translation.

It is noteworthy that the linguistic expression of the ST and the Russian translation are closely aligned, as the translation of Belger and Kim was directly derived from the original text, whereas the translation of Fitzpatrick was indirectly derived from the aforementioned Russian translation. It is also important to note that in the majority of cases, the text of mediated translation is identical to that of direct translation. The translator employs a range of strategies and methods of metaphorical translation (Plotnikov, 2018), as well as those used for the entire text. In conclusion, it can be stated that the source domain “footprint” (13), represented by the cognitive metaphor “*footprint is life path*”, is adequately conveyed in the DT. Despite the insignificant number of eliminations and inconsistencies in the DT, the translator has achieved compliance with the communicative intention of the source text author in the translated text and equivalence and adequacy in the adaptation and representation of the cognitive metaphor “*footprint is life path*” through the use of translation transformations and linguistic and cognitive methods of metaphor transfer. The mediated translation does not fully reflect the frame-element structure of the original cognitive metaphor, thus preventing the author’s communicative intention from being realized adequately. The text of the mediated translation is significantly distanced from the original due to numerous omissions of fragments containing the source domain “footprint”. The inconsistency of the pragmatic function of the mediated translation with the original has led to a decrease in the stylistic coloring of the translation text (Alzhanova et al., 2023). The comparative analysis of the cognitive metaphor “*footprint is life path*” suggests that it is a universal concept in Kazakh and Russian linguistic cultures, shaped by historical, geographical, socio-economic, and political factors. The linguistic, cognitive, and cultural worldviews of Kazakh and Russian linguistic cultures are clearly aligned in this regard. A comparison of the mediated translation with the original text revealed a discrepancy between the author’s communicative intentions and the alienation of the Kazakh and English worldviews due to linguistic and stylistic changes made in the text. Consequently, the national-cultural specificity of the perception of footprints reflecting the life path in the Kazakh linguoculture is not fully reflected in the mediated translation. The comparative analysis revealed a mismatch between the frame-element structure of the original and translations, which affected the equivalence of metaphor translation in the cognitive metaphor adaptation. The conclusion is clear: the cognitive metaphor “*footprint is life path*” is not fully reflected in the mediated translation, and the translation is distant from the original. In contrast, the direct translation is closer to the source text.

Metaphor translation occupies a central place among Kazakhstani scientists in cognitive linguistics and remains an actual object of research. This study examines the problem of representation of Nurpeisov’s cognitive metaphor “*footprint is life path*” in direct and indirect translation. A comparative analysis of the text of the novel Sońgy Paryz and its translations permitted a comprehensive study of the world pictures of Kazakh, Russian, and English linguistic cultures.

Further research may be conducted on the authorial cognitive metaphors in Nurpeisov's novels in order to gain a deeper understanding of the author's style and linguistic, cultural, and cognitive world pictures. Concurrently, the comparative analysis allows us to examine how cognitive metaphors are represented in the source text in the target text via the intermediary text.

## Disclosure Statement

The authors claim no conflict of interest.

## Funding

The research did not receive any specific grants from funding agencies.

## References

- Aizhan, M., Bektay, G., & Kali, A. (2021). *Peculiarities and difficulties of translating metaphors in the framework of Kazakhstani political discourse* [Master's thesis, M. S. Narikbayev KAZGUU University School of Liberal Arts]. M. S. Narikbayev KAZGUU University School of Liberal Arts.
- Alzhanova, A., Balmagambetova, Z., & Bochina, T. (2023). The role of mediating text in adapting indirect literary translation. *Bulletin of the Karaganda University. Philology Series*, 3(111), 35-41. <https://doi.org/10.31489/2023ph3/35-41>
- Baranov, A. (2003). On types of metaphorical models' combinations. *Voprosy Yazykoznaniya*, 2, 73-94.
- Baranov, A., & Karaulov, Y. (1991). *Russkaya politicheskaya metafora (materialy k slovaryu)* [Russian political metaphor (dictionary materials)]. Institut Russkogo Yazyka RAN.
- Baranov, G. (1994). *Rol' metafory v teoreticheskom poznanii i reprezentacii socialnoi realnosti (filosofskii analiz)* [The role of metaphor in theoretical cognition and representation of social reality (philosophical analysis)] [Doctoral dissertation, Novosibirsk State University]. Novosibirsk State University.
- Breitman, K., Barbosa, S., Casanova, M., & Furtado, A. (2007). Conceptual modeling by analogy and metaphor. In A. O. Falcão & O. H. Olsen (Eds.), *The Sixteenth ACM Conference on Conference on Information and Knowledge Management (CIKM '07)* (pp. 865–868). Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1321440.1321562>
- Brown, G., Yule, G. (2000). *Discourse Analysis*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- Budaev, E. (2007). Development of cognitive theory of metaphor. *Lingvokul'turologiya*, 1, 19-35. <http://elar.uspu.ru/handle/uspu/2736>
- Budaev, E., & Chudinov, A. (2008). *Metafora v politicheskoy kommunikacii: monografiya* [Metaphor in political communication: Monograph]. Nauka.
- Budaev, E., & Chudinov, A. (2013). Kognitivnaia teoriia metafory: Novye gorizonty [Cognitive theory of metaphor: New horizons]. *Izvestia. Ural Federal University Journal, Problems of Education, Science and Culture*, 1(110), 6-13.
- Burmakova, E., & Marugina, N. (2014). Cognitive approach to metaphor translation in literary discourse. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 154, 527-533.
- Cambridge University Press. (n.d.). Footprints. In *Cambridge dictionary*. Retrieved July 5, 2023, from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english-russian/footprint?q=footprints>
- Cambridge University Press. (n.d.). Tracks. In *Cambridge dictionary*. Retrieved July 5, 2023, from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english-russian/tracks>
- Chudinov, A. (2001). *Rossii v metaforicheskom zerkale (1991–2000): Kognitivnye issledovaniia politicheskoi metafory* [Russia in the metaphorical mirror (1991–2000): Cognitive studies of political metaphor]. Ural State Pedagogical University.
- Chudinov, A. (2003). *Metaforicheskaya mozaika v sovremennoi politicheskoi kommunikatsii: Monografiya* [Metaphorical mosaic in modern political communication: A monograph]. Ural State Pedagogical University Publisher.
- Chudinov, A. (2013). *Ocherki po sovremennoj politicheskoy metaforologii: Monografiya* [Essays on current political metaphorology: A monograph]. Ural State Pedagogical University.



- Dyatlova, A., & Pavlova, N. (2017). Metaphoric models in contemporary English language political discourse. *Izvestiia vysshikh uchebnykh zavedenii. Povoljskii region. Gumanitarnye Nauki*, 1(41), 121–129.
- Fauconnier, G., & Turner, M. (1998). Conceptual integration networks. *Cognitive Science*, 22(2), 133–187. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0364-0213\(99\)80038-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0364-0213(99)80038-X)
- Hasar, R., Tavangar, M., & Rezai, V. (2013). Metaphor and cultural models in translation. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 5(5), 138–155. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v5i5.4267>
- He, K. (2017). On obstacles of metaphor translation from perspective of culture. *English Language and Literature Studies*, 7, 126–130. <http://doi.org/10.5539/ells.v7n1p126>
- Kiseleva, L., Todosienko, Z., Lukmanova, R., & Kuular, E. (2022). Metafora kak sredstvo vizualizatsii ob'ekta naimenovaniia v mediatekstakh (Namaterialerusskogo, angliiskogo, tatarskogo i tuvinskogoiazykov) [Metaphor as a means of visualizing an object of naming in media texts (A case study of the Russian, English, Tatar and Tuvan languages)]. *New Research of Tuva*, 4, 243–256. <https://www.doi.org/10.25178/nit.2022.4.18>
- Kobozeva, I. (2002, June 5–18). *Towards formal representation of metaphors within the ramifications of cognitive approach* [Paper presentation]. Dialog-2002: Komp'yuternaya Lingvistika I Intellektual'nye Tekhnologii, Moscow, Russia.
- Kövecses, Z., & Benczes, R. (2002). *Metaphor: A practical introduction*. Oxford University Press.
- Kudryavtseva, L. (1993). *Modelirovanie dinamiki slovarnogo sostava yazyka* [Modeling the dynamics of the vocabulary of the language]. Novosibirsk State University Publishing House.
- Kunilovskaya, M., & Korovodina, N. (2010). Author's metaphor as an object of translation. *Lingua Mobilis*, 4(23), 73–81.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G., & Kövecses, Z. (1987). The cognitive model of anger inherent in American English. In D. Holland & N. Quinn (Eds.), *Cultural models in language and thought* (pp. 195–221). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511607660.009>
- Li, W. (2017). The complexity of indirect translation. Reflections on the Chinese translation and reception of H. C. Andersen's tales. *Orbis Litterarum*, 72(3), 181–208. <https://doi.org/10.1111/oli.12148>
- Lunkova, L., & Pavlova, M. (2018). Cognitive aspect of English-Russian metaphor translation in Julian Barnes's talking it over. *RUDN Journal of Language Studies, Semiotics and Semantics*, 9(4), 904–910.
- Nurpeisov, A. (1999). *Soňgy paryz* [Final respects]. Zhazushy Publisher.
- Nurpeisov, A. (2002). *Poslednii dolg* [Final respects]. RIK Kul'tura Publisher.
- Nurpeisov, A. (2013). *Final respects*. Liberty Publishing House.
- Plotnikov, I. (2018). *Metaforicheskie modeli i ih perevodcheskie transformacii v hudozhestvennom tekste: lingvokognitivnyi aspekt* [Metaphorical models and their translation transformations in a literary text: Linguocognitive aspect] [Candidate's thesis, Ural State Pedagogical University]. Ural State Pedagogical University.
- Qazaq Tiliniń Túsindirme Sózdigi. (n.d.). I3. In *Qazaq Tiliniń Túsindirme Sózdigi*. Retrieved July 5, 2023, from <http://kaz.slovopedia.com/146/53382/1529863.html>
- Rakymzhan, O., Shalabay, B., Zhumagulova, O., Kazhibayeva, G., & Kairbekova, I. (2022). Existential loneliness in Kazakh literature and modern world literature: Cross-cultural insights from metaphors and frame based analysis. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 10(3), 103–116. <https://doi.org/10.22034/ijsc.2022.543086.2468>
- Segal, N. (2017). Metaforicheskie modeli kak ob'ekt sovremennykh lingvisticheskikh issledovaniy [Metaphorical models as an object of modern linguistic research]. *Uchenye Zapiski Krymskogo Federal'nogo Universitetaimeni V. I. Vernadskogo. Filologicheskie Nauki*, 3(69), 108–117.
- Seliverstova, Z., & Zhunusova, Z. (2018). Metaforicheskaia eksplikatsiia kontsepta “Amerika” v kognitivnom kontekste G. D. Grebenshchikova. [Metaphorical explication of the concept “America” in the cognitive context of G. D. Grebenshchikov]. *Studia Slavica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 63(2), 417–425. <https://doi.org/10.1556/060.2018.63.2.20>
- Shalimova, D., & Shalimova, I. (2020). Peter Newmark's translation techniques on the material of translations of metaphors in Stephen King's works. *SibScript*, 22(81), 278–287.

- Shamne, N., & Yanina, V. (2014). Metaforicheskoe modelirovanie neprostranstvennykh sfer v sovremennom angliiskom iazyke [Metaphorical modeling of non-spatial spheres in modern English]. *Vestnik Volgogradskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta, Iazykoznanie*, 2(21), 39–45. <https://doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu2.2014.2.5>
- Shatalov, D. (2007). Ekvivalentnost' perevoda metaforicheskikh vyrazhenii [Equivalence of translation of metaphorical expressions]. *Bulletin of Voronezh State University*, 1, 154–159.
- Shekhovskaya, Y., & Peretyatko, A. (2019). Somaticheskaya metafora (Na material angliiskogo i ispanskogo iazykov) [Somatic metaphor (On the material of English and Spanish languages)]. *Bulletin of Samara University. History, Pedagogy, Philology*, 25(2), 146-152.
- Skrebtsova, T. (2000). *The American school of cognitive linguistics*. Russian Academy of Science.
- Strelnikova, O. (2015). Metaphor of family in the English political discourse. *RUDN Journal of Language Studies, Semiotics and Semantics*, 4, 16-25.
- Temirgazina, Z. (2017). Zoomorfnaya model' metaforizatsii v russkoy i kazakhskoy zoologicheskoy terminologii [Zoomorphic model of metaphorization in Russian and Kazakh zoological terminology]. *Tambov University Review. Series: Philology and Culturology*, 3(9), 5-9.
- Toleubayeva, A., Zholshayeva, M., Kerimbekova, B., Muratova, G., & Dzhakipova, G. (2017). Peculiarities of metaphor translation in a literary text (based on A. Nurpeisov's novel "Final Respects"). *Papers on Language and Literature*, 53, 237-243.
- Tolkovy Slovar Russkogo Iazyka Ozhegova. (n.d.). След. In *Tolkovy Slovar Russkogo Iazyka Ozhegova*. Retrieved July 5, 2023, from <https://ozhegov.slovaronline.com/32302-SLED>
- Trichik, M. (2014). *Konceptual'nye metafory v politicheskom diskurse (na materiale predvybornoy rechi B. Obamy i M. Romni)* [Conceptual metaphors in political discourse (based on the pre-election speeches of B. Obama and M. Romney)] [PhD doctoral dissertation, Kazakh Ablai Khan University of International Relations and World Languages]. Kazakh Ablai Khan University of International Relations and World Languages.
- Trynkova, O. (2008). Koncept "History" v sostave metaforicheskikh modelei v angloiazыchnom postmodernistskom romane [The concept "History" in the composition of metaphorical models in the English-language postmodern novel]. *Izvestiia Tul'skogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Gumanitarnye nauki*, 2, 255-259.
- Turner, M., & Fauconnier, G. (1995). Conceptual integration and formal expression. *Journal of metaphor and Symbolic Activity*, 3, 183-203. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327868ms1003\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327868ms1003_3)
- Yakovenko, T., & Shaikhaliyeva, A. (2021). Sposoby perevoda metafor v zarubezhnoy teorii perevoda [Methods of translating metaphors in foreign translation theory]. *Humanities and Social Sciences*, 4, 200-208.
- Zahid, A. (2019). *A model for metaphor translation from English literature into Arabic* [Master's thesis, Durham University School of Modern Languages and Cultures]. Durham University School of Modern Languages and Cultures.
- Zhunussova, Z., Alexeyeva, O., & Ivanova, N. (2023). Metaphoricity as the most important characteristic of modern political discourse. *Eurasian Journal of Philology: Science and Education*, 1(189), 48-56. <https://doi.org/10.26577/EJPh.2023.v189.i1.ph6>